1 2 3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 4 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 5 6 IN RE: SOCIAL MEDIA ADOLESCENT Case No. 4:22-md-03047-YGR ADDICTION/PERSONAL INJURY 7 PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION MDL No. 3047 8 CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER NO. 9 This Document Relates to: RE ADJUSTMENTS TO THE PLAINTIFFS' 9 **ALL CASES** ATTORNEYS' LEADERSHIP STRUCTURE 10 11 12 TO ALL PARTIES AND COUNSEL OF RECORD: 13 From the outset of this MDL, the Court has expressed its concern that the requested 14 leadership structure for plaintiffs' counsel has been too large. With that perspective, the Court has 15 considered the various requests for reappointment to plaintiffs' leadership required under Case 16 Management Order No. 6. (See Dkt. No. 451 at 3-4.) Having carefully considered the requests and 17 having conducted ex parte meetings with certain plaintiffs' counsel following the January 26, 2024 18 further case management conference, the Court makes the following adjustments: 19 Chris Seeger is appointed Counsel to the Co-Lead Counsel and Settlement Counsel, as 20 opposed to a Co-Lead Counsel with day-to-day responsibilities. Lexi Hazam and 21 Previn Warren shall remain as Co-Lead Counsel. 22 Emily Jeffcott and Joseph VanZandt are appointed "Federal/State Liaisons," as opposed 23 to members of Plaintiffs' Steering Committee Leadership, given that they are currently 24 actively engaged as the co-leads for California's Judicial Council Coordination 25 Proceedings ("JCCP"). 26 James Bilsborrow is appointed to Plaintiffs' Steering Committee Leadership. 27 28

Ron Austin is removed from Plaintiffs' Steering Committee membership as he did not submit a request for reappointment as ordered. Unless otherwise noted in this order, the leadership structure established in Case Management Order Nos. 1 and 6 remains in effect. (See Dkt. Nos. 75 at 1-3; 451 at 4-5.) Plaintiffs' counsel are reminded that, under Case Management Order No. 6, the Court will consider adjustments to plaintiffs' leadership on a yearly basis. With respect to future requests for appointment, counsel are advised that the Court expects to receive, in support of each such request, timekeeping records for the preceding calendar year with sufficient detail to describe the work performed for that year in the categories outlined in the Common Benefit Order. (See Dkt. No. 169 at 8-10.) Most, but not all, counsel provided that detail in the pending submissions. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: February 2, 2024 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE